

WHAT IS CLAIMED IS:

1. ^{Sub A6} An improved method for journals to facilitate a peer review process between authors, reviewers, and editors, over a computer network comprising the steps of:

the author submits an article to the journal via the network;

qualified reviewers are assigned to review the article;

the reviewers complete an evaluation form for the article;

the reviewers submit the evaluation form to the journal;

the author enters responses to the reviewers evaluation form directly into the evaluation form;

the editors consider each reviewer's evaluation form and the author's responses;

the editors make a publication decision for the article; and

the editors inform the author and the reviewers of the publication decision.

2. The method of claim 1 whereby the qualified reviewers are automatically selected by generating a list of keywords ranked according to their relative weight in describing the content of the article and comparing the keywords to keywords associated with user profiles stored in a database accessible by the journal.

^{Sub A7 3} The method of claim 2 whereby the qualified reviewers are additionally selected by the dates the qualified reviewers are available and the past performance of the reviewers, including the reviewers timeliness, thoroughness, clarity, and the number of completed reviews.

4. The method of claim 3 whereby the author reviews the list of keywords ranked according to their relative weight in describing the content of the article and makes necessary changes prior to approving the list of ranked keywords.

5. The method of claim 1 whereby each reviewer submits the evaluation form by connecting to the Web site and entering comments into the evaluation form.

6. The method of claim 1 whereby articles submitted by the author are automatically reformatted into a standard format by the journal and presented to the author for approval.

7. The method of claim 1 whereby the authors, reviewers, and editors access the journal with a username and password.

8. The method of claim 1 whereby the author is informed of the publication decision by email or by notice on a Web site.

9. A method for facilitating a peer review process using a Web site as a central channel for communication between authors, reviewers, and editors, comprising the steps of:

an author connects to the Web site and submits an article to the Web site;

the Web site searches a database and generates a ranked list of qualified potential reviewers for the article;

the Web site automatically contacts each potential reviewer on the ranked list and requests that the potential reviewer agree to review the article;

the potential reviewers connect to the Web site and agree to review the article;

the reviewers who agree access the article through the Web site;

the reviewers complete an evaluation form for the article and submit the

evaluation form to the Web site;

the Web site notifies the author that an evaluation form has been received;

the author connects to the Web site and enters responses to the evaluation form directly into the evaluation form;

5 the Web site notifies an editor that an evaluation form with responses has been received;

the editor examines the evaluation form and makes a publication decision; and

the editor notifies the author and reviewers of the publication decision.

10. The method of claim 9 whereby the reviewers connect to the Web site and complete the evaluation form.

11. The method of claim 10 whereby each reviewer has access to completed evaluation forms for an article after the reviewer has submitted an evaluation form for that same article.

12. The method of claim 11 whereby each reviewer can set confidential or open access privileges for sections of the reviewer's completed evaluation form.

15 13. The method of claim 9 whereby authors, reviewers and editors each have a user account with the Web site and connect to the Web site by entering a username and password combination.

14. The method of claim 13 whereby a single user account can be for an author, reviewer, editor, or any combination of author, reviewer, and editor.

20 15. The method of claim 9 whereby the article submitted by the author is automatically reformatted into a standard format by the Web site.

16. The method of claim 9 whereby the title and text of the article are parsed by the Web site to generate a list of keywords ranked according to their relative weight in describing the content of the article and the ranked keywords are used to search a database and generate a list of potential reviewers.

17. The method of claim 9 whereby the Web site facilitates the peer review process for more than one publication.

18. The method of claim 9 whereby multiple reviewers complete evaluation forms for each article and multiple editors examine the evaluation forms for each article and the editors communicate with each other via the Web site to arrive at the publication decision for each article.

19. The method of claim 9 whereby the Web site allows the article to iterate through the peer review process until the article is approved for publication.

20. The method of claim 19 whereby after an article has been approved for publication a copy editor creates a galley proof of the article, the author and editor approve the galley proof, and the article is immediately published on the Web site.

21. A method for facilitating the peer review process using a Web site as a central channel for communication between authors, reviewers, and editors who each have password protected access to the Web site, comprising:

an author submitting an article to the Web site;

the reviewers reviewing the article and providing an evaluation form to the author and editors through the Web site;

the author responding to the reviewers comments directly within each evaluation form; and

the editors examining each evaluation form, making a publication decision regarding the article, and notifying the author and reviewers of the publication decision.

- 5 22. The method of claim 19 ¹⁹ whereby the publication decision is acceptance of the article pending a revision such that the revision iteratively comprises:

the authors editing the article and resubmitting the article to the reviewers;

the reviewers reevaluating the article and completing an evaluation form;

the authors responding to each evaluation form; and

the editors examining the evaluation forms and the author's response and making a publication decision.

345
23. The method of claim 21 whereby a group of authors collaborate via the Web site to co-author an article and submit the co-authored article to the Web site.

24. The method of claim 23 whereby each co-author responds to each evaluation form.